

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2, 3, and 6-14 have been amended to further define the recitations provided therein. Claim 1 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 2-4 and 6-14 are pending and under consideration. Claims 3, 4, and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

REQUEST OF TRANSLATED JAPANESE OFFICE ACTION:

In response to tOn page 2 of the Office Action, it is requested that the Japanese Office Action submitted in an IDS on March 5, 2004 be translated into the English language. Applicants enclose herewith a translated copy of the Japanese Office Action.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS:

In the Office Action, at page 4, claims 10 and 12 are objected to as "feature amounts of patterns" in line 9 of claims 10 and 12 lacks antecedent support. It is respectfully asserted that, in line 9 of claims 10 and 12, "feature amounts of patterns" is the first instance when this recitation appears in each claim. Because the recitation is in plural tense, Applicants hereby assert that there is proper antecedent support for such recitation in claims 10 and 12.

Claims 10 and 12 have been amended to improve antecedent support for "the recognition candidate word." Furthermore, claims 6, 7, and 13 have been amended to improve clarity of the recitations set forth therein and in view of the objections thereto.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

In the Office Action, at page 5, claims 1 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,675,665 to Lyon ("Lyon"). This rejection is traversed and

reconsideration is requested.

Because claim 1 has been cancelled and claims 9-14 have been amended incorporating the recitations of claim 7, which is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of claims 1 and 9-14 is rendered moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, at page 7, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Lyon and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,256 to Brown et al. ("Brown"). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Because claim 2 depends from independent claim 7, which stands in condition for allowance, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection to the claim is hereby rendered moot and requested that dependent claim 2 be allowed.

In the Office Action, at page 8, claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Lyon and in view of Kim et al. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Because claims 6 and 8 depend from independent claim 7, which stands in condition for allowance, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection to the claim is hereby rendered moot and requested that dependent claims 6 and 8 be allowed.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution


can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____ July 13, 004 _____

By:  _____
Alicia M. Choi
Registration No. 46,621

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

NOTICE OF REJECTION GROUNDS

Patent application No: H10-308943
Date of drafting the notice: Dec. 1, 2003
Patent examiner: Isao MATSUURA 9181 5H00
Applicant's attorney: Yoshiyuki OSUGA and another
Applicable clauses: Article 29, item 2 and Article 36

Above captioned application is to be rejected on the below stated grounds. Applicant may submit their opinion on this rejection within 60 days after the dispatch date of this notice.

Grounds

[1] It is determined that the inventions associated with below-identified claims of this application have been easy for an ordinary skilled person in the art to arrive at before filing of this application based on the inventions disclosed in the below-listed publications, which have been issued in Japan or in other countries before the filing of this application. These inventions associated with this application, therefore, are not allowed for a patent under Article 29, item 2 of the Patent Law.

Detail

(see separate List of Specifics of Referenced Documents and the Like
for detail of the reference documents indicated by document numbers)

- Claim 1, 2, 5, 8-13
- Reference document 1
- Notes

Document 1 describes about a word recognition apparatus comprising an address database storing address data, a recognition dictionary memory storing reference patterns respectively associated with characters, a character generation unit generating, by using the reference patterns as its elements, a character image representing a word estimated based on the address data, and a equivalence confirmation unit confirming equivalence between the character image and an input character string. It is considered an ordinary and conventional technology to keep the character image generated by the character generation unit in a memory only temporarily for the equivalence

confirmation and erasing from the memory every after the equivalence confirmation for memorizing newly another character image.

- Claim 6
- Referenced documents 1 and 2
- Notes

The technology associated with using the direction index histogram as a feature amount in conducting a character recognition is a prior art technology as it is described, for example, in document 2, and, therefore, it would have been easily possible for a person in the art to employ the direction index histogram as a feature amount for operating the word recognition apparatus in document 1. It is considered a matter of selecting one of available design options to align a number of direction index histograms respectively associated with characters of a set for constituting the feature amount of a word.

- Claim 7
- Reference document 1 and 3
- Notes

The technology associated with using the DP matching in conducting a character recognition is a prior art technology as it is described, for example, in document 3, and, therefore, it would have been easily possible for a person in the art to employ the DP matching technology for equivalence confirmation when operating the character recognition apparatus described in document 1 for confirming the equivalence between a character image and an input character string.

List of Specifics of Referenced Documents and the Like

1. Japanese Patent Application, Publication No: H08-287188 gazette
2. Japanese Patent Application, Publication No: S59-177684 gazette
3. Japanese Patent Application, Publication No: H03-051982 gazette